

A comparison of the laryngeal mask airway with the oropharyngeal airway and facemask to achieve manual ventilation in children as performed by critical care and anaesthetic nurses

Submission date 14/03/2006	Recruitment status No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
Registration date 02/05/2006	Overall study status Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
Last Edited 07/12/2010	Condition category Respiratory	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

Plain English summary of protocol
Not provided at time of registration

Contact information

Type(s)
Scientific

Contact name
Dr David Mason

Contact details
Nuffield Department of Anaesthetics
John Radcliffe Hospital
Headley Way
Oxford
United Kingdom
OX3 9DU

Additional identifiers

Protocol serial number
Version 7

Study information

Scientific Title

Acronym

PAWS

Study objectives

Does the laryngeal mask airway (LMA) have a superior efficacy in achieving manual ventilation (breathing) compared with the current recommended technique for children who are not breathing, when used by critical care and anaesthetic nurses?

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

Approved by the Oxford Research Ethics Committee B on 17/08/2005, reference number: 05/Q1605/104

Study design

Randomised, controlled, efficacy study

Primary study design

Interventional

Study type(s)

Quality of life

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Children undergoing ASA I or II surgery or an MRI scan

Interventions

Insertion of a LMA airway versus oropharyngeal airway. Patients have both airways inserted, however the order of the insertion is randomised, immediately prior to inserting the airway, the nurse opens a sealed opaque envelope generated using a table of random numbers which states which airway should be inserted first.

Intervention Type

Other

Phase

Not Specified

Primary outcome(s)

Chest excursion

Key secondary outcome(s)

1. Minute volume achieved by nurse and anaesthetist
2. Time to first breath
3. Mean inhaled and exhaled tidal volume

Completion date

01/09/2006

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

1. Patients aged between 6 months and 8 years scheduled for anaesthesiologists physical status (ASA) I and II surgery or a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan
2. Patients who would routinely have an LMA inserted

Participant type(s)

Patient

Healthy volunteers allowed

No

Age group

Child

Lower age limit

6 months

Upper age limit

8 years

Sex

All

Key exclusion criteria

1. Patients with an expected difficult airway
2. Patients with oesophageal reflux
3. Patients under 6 months
4. Patients 9 years or older

Date of first enrolment

01/09/2005

Date of final enrolment

01/09/2006

Locations

Countries of recruitment

United Kingdom

England

Study participating centre

Nuffield Department of Anaesthetics
Oxford
United Kingdom
OX3 9DU

Sponsor information

Organisation

Oxford Radcliffe Hospitals NHS Trust (UK)

ROR

<https://ror.org/03h2bh287>

Funder(s)

Funder type

Charity

Funder Name

The Resuscitation Council UK

Results and Publications

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration

Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Results article	results	01/08/2007		Yes	No